Terry Lynn Hawkins V-31556 California State Prison L.A.C. Facility A, H.U. A2, Cell 240 2008 SEP -8 P.O. Box 8457 Lancaster Ca. 93539-8457 CLERK US DISTRICT C SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CA IN PROPRIA PERSONA 5 DEPUTY 6 UNC PRO TUNC SEP -2 2008 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 TERRY LYNN HAWKINS Case No CV 08-0678 J (PCL) 12 Petitioner NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR DEFAULT JUDGMENT UNDER 13 -VS-FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE RULE 55(a)(b) 14 MATTHEW CATES, Secretary MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT 15 Respondent THEREOF: Date; 9/04/08 16 Time: 9:00 A.M. 17 TO ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CALIFORNIA EDMUND G. BROWN JR. ATTORNEY FOR 18 MATTHEW CATES: 19 Please take notice on September 04, 2008 at 9:00 a.m. or soon thereafter as this matter may be heard before Magistrate Judge Peter C. Lewis in The United States District Court Southern District Of California; 880 Front St. San Diego Ca. 92101-8900. Petitioner request an ORDER granting his Default Judgment pursuant 23 Federal Rules Of Civil Procedure Rule 55(a)(b). Dated; AversT 25, 2008 25 26 Lynn Hawkins 27

Document 8

Filed 09/08/2008

Page 1 of 16

Case 3:08-cv-00678-J-PCL

COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. 8-72)

Terry Lynn Hawkins will move the court pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 55(a)(b) for Default Judgment against

26 Matthew Cates Secretary of California Department Of Corrections and

27

1 Rehabilitation.

2

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

On June 05, 2008 Petitioner's petition for writ of habeas corpus was filed in this court <u>Hawkins</u> V. <u>Cates</u> Secretary Case Number CV 08-0678 J (PCL). (See Order Sua Sponte Substituting Respondent append in EXHIBIT A.)

On June 06, 2008 the Honorable Peter C. Lewis issued an order the order append in EXHIBIT A.)

On page 2 of the order line 11-12 the order states; Respondent shall file a motion to dismiss pursuant to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing § 2254 cases no later than July 21, 2008.

on page 2 line 18-19 the order states; If Respondent files a motion to dismiss, Petitioner shall file his opposition if any to the motion no later than August 21, 2008.

On page 2 line 25-26, page 3 line 1-2 the order states; If
Respondent does not contend that the petition can be decided without the court reaching the merits of petitioner's claims,
Respondent shall file and serve an answer to the petition as well as
points and authorities in support of such answer, no later than
August 04, 2008.

On page 3 line 8-9 the order states; Petitioner may file a Traverse to matters raised in this answer no later than September 04, 2008.

Petitioner hereby submit; On August 18, 2008 Petitioner had not received Respondent's answer.

Petitioner hereby submit; On August 19, 2008 Petitioner called the Clerk's Office and spoke with Deputy Clerk Marissa, after

checking the court docket the Deputy Clerk Marissa admitted that Respondent hadn't filed a answer to the petition for writ of habeas corpus.

On August 19, 2008 Petitioner made the Clerk's Office aware of the facts that Petitioner would be filing a Motion pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure under Rule 55(a-b) requesting a default judgment for failure to abide by and adhere to a Federal Court order. It is important to keep straight default language a review of the terms regarding defaults is appropriate a default occurs when the Respondent has failed to plead or otherwise respond to the complaint within the time required by the Federal Rules, an entry of default is what the clerk enter when the default is established by affidavit, or otherwise. Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 55(a) 1./ New York Life Ins. Co. V. Brown 84 F.3d 137, 138, 141 (5th Cir. 1996).

Petitioner hereby submit; Petitioner states two crucial grounds for relief that proves him legal, actual and factual innocence.

- 1) The <u>Fifth</u> and <u>Fourteenth Amendments</u> requires reversal on the conviction in counts one through three because there was insufficient evidence such that the jury could have found beyond a reasonable doubt that Petitioner was the robber.
- 2) It violated the <u>Fifth</u> and <u>Fourteenth Amendment</u> not to determine what quantum of evidence is necessary to establish sufficient of evidence to establish identity when eyewitness effectively
- 1./ All rule reference are to the Federal Rules Of Civil Procedure

excluded Petitioner as the perpetrator.

In the instant case Respondent defaulted because Respondent did not file an answer within the allowed time. See New York Life Ins.
Co. V. Brown 84 F.3d 137, 138, 141 (5ht Cir 1996).

When party has failed to plead or otherwise defend against certain pleadings, entry of default must precede grant of default judgment. Federal Rules Of Civil Procedure Rule 7(a) Rule 55(a-b) 28 U.S.C.A. Johnson V. Dayton Elec. Mfg. Co. 140 F.3d 781, 782, 783 (8th Cir. 1998).

When considering motion for default judgment, court must first determine that Petitioner has made prima facie showing of court's personal jurisdiction over defaulting party; it is not necessary to hold a hearing to make this determination if Petitioner's entitlement to relief is evident from record. Federal Rules Of Civil procedure Rule 55 28 U.S.C.A. King Vision Pay-Per-View Ltd. V. Spice Restaurant 244 F.Supp.2d 1173, 1174, 1177 (D. Kan. 2003).

Default judgment usually is available only when adversary process has been halted because of essentially unresponsive party, as diligent party must be protected lest he be faced with intermenable delay and continued uncertainty as to his rights.

United States V. Gant 268 F.Supp.2d 29, 32 (D.D.C. 2003).

Default judgment would be entered against Attorney General in habeas corpus action, in that Petitioner had state at least one valid Constitutional claim which had been exhausted in state court, while Petitioner had diligently sought to have his claims heard, Attorney General had been dilatory in extreme, Attorney General

never communicated with court on three occasions when deadline set by court had been ignored, state Attorney General had been dilatory and casual about missing deadlines in the past, and Petitioner had served a substantial amount of his sentence. Federal Rules Of Civil Procedure Rule.5528 U.S.C.A. Bermudez V. Reid 570 F.Supp. 290, 295-296 (S.D. N.Y. 1983).

The Supreme Court has emphasized that the writ of habeas corpus

is intended to provide "'a swift and imperative remedy in all cases of illegal restraint or confinement" Fay V. Noia 372 U.S. 391, 400, 83 S.CT. 822, 828, 9 L.Ed.2d 837 (1963) (quoting <u>3 Blackstone</u> Commentaries 129). See also Preiser V. Rodriquez 411 U.S. 475, 495, 93 S.CT. 1827, 1839, 36 L.Ed.2d 439 (1973) (habeas claims should receive "a swift flexible and summary determination"). The governing statute also dictates expediency. E.g., 28 U.S.C. § 2243 (1976) (habeas claims to be dealt "forthwith"). Put simply, "The writ of habeas corpus challenging illegality of detention, is reduced to a sham if the trial courts do not act within a reasonable time." Jones V. Shell 572 F.2d 1278, 1280 (8th Cir. 1978). Indeed a sufficient delay may offend due process. See id see also Ruiz V. Cady 660 F.2d 337, 341, n. 5 (7th Cir. 1981). Finally looking to Congressional intent, some courts have held the 40 days prescribed in Federal Rules Of Civil Procedure Rule 8(a)(2) as the time in which an answer must be filed is a mandatory deadline not to be exceeded. Mattox V. Scott 507 F.2d 919, 925 (7 th Cir, 1974); Allen V. Perini 291 F. Supp. 144 (N.D. Ohio 1970). (quoting Bermudez V. Reid 570 F. Supp. at Pp. 292, 293.

27

26

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

....

In a case where the petitioner clearly sets forth a claim which, if true, would entitle the petitioner to relief, we think neither approach make sense the first approach would not make sense because at the hearing the Petitioner would simply testify to that which he had already set forth in his petition. Testimony being "competent evidence," Allen V. Perina 424 F.2d at 138, and there being no contrary facts in evidence, Petitioner would thus have met his "burden [of proving] that he is in custody in violation of the Constitution," id, by merely repeating in court the averments of his sworn petition. Bermudez V. Reid 570 F.Supp. at 293.

Looking first at Federal law, there can be no question but that Congress had in mind distinct roles of the court, the Petitioner and the Respondent in a habeas action. The scheme outlining these roles is set out in the Rules governing Section 2254 cases in the United States District Courts [hereafter "2254 Rules"] 28 U.S.C. foll § 2254 (1976). See Rule 1, 2254 Rules, Rule 4 provides that it is the Respondent who must file an answer, Rule 5 details what the answer must contain and requires that the Respondent (1) respond to the allegations of the petition (2) State whether the Petitioner has exhausted his claims. (3) Attach relevant portions of transcripts or a narrative summary and (4) Attach copies of the Petitioner's brief on appeal and a copy of any appellate decisions. Thus it would contravene the Federal statutory scheme for the district court to take over these functions, and these functions would have to be taken over if the court were to "test" the merits

26

EXHIBIT A

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA TERRY LYNN HAWKINS, Civil No. 08-0678 J (PCL) Petitioner, ORDER SUA SPONTE SUBSTITUTING MATTHEW CATE, Secretary, Respondent.

Petitioner, a state prisoner, has filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. It has come to the Court's attention that Matthew Cate has recently been appointed Secretary of the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation.

A writ of habeas corpus acts upon the custodian of the state prisoner. See 28 U.S.C. § 2242; Rule 2(a), 28 U.S.C. foll. § 2254. Because the Secretary of the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation has changed, so has Petitioner's custodian. Accordingly, in order to conform with the requirements of Rule 2(a) of the Rules Governing § 2254 Cases, the Court hereby sua sponte ORDERS the substitution of Matthew Cate, Secretary of the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, as Respondent. See Ortiz-Sandoval v. Gomez, 81 F.3d 891, 894 (9th Cir. 1996) (stating that the respondent in § 2254 proceedings may be the chief officer in charge of state penal institutions); see also FED. R. CIV. P. 25(d)(1) ("When a public official is a party to an action in his official capacity and during its pendency dies, resigns, or otherwise ceases to hold office, the action does not abate and

Cases 8:080 & v. 0067878-9-PCL Document rit: 6-1 Fileat @ Fileat 206/05/2008 1 Page 62 of 2

the officer's successor is automatically substituted as a party.") The Clerk of the Court shall modify the docket to reflect "Matthew Cate, Secretary" in place of the former respondent. **DATED:** June 5, 2008 Peter C. Lewis U.S. Magistrate Judge United States District Court

1 2 3 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 10 11 TERRY LYNN HAWKINS, Civil No. 08-0678 J (PCL) 12 Petitioner, 13 v. 14 15 ORDER REOPENING CASE AND MATTHEW CATE, Secretary, 16 17 Respondent. 18 19 20 On April 14, 2008, Petitioner, proceeding pro se, submitted a Petition for Writ of Habeas 21 Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. In its April 18, 2008 Order, the Court dismissed this case 22 without prejudice because Petitioner failed to satisfy the filing fee requirement. Petitioner was 23 instructed that to have this case reopened he had to either pay the \$5.00 filing fee or submit 24 adequate proof of his inability to pay the fee no later than June 20, 2008. 25 On May 28, 2008, Petitioner paid the \$5.00 filing pursuant to this Court's Order. Based 26 on this Court's review of the Petition, the Court ORDERS that this case be reopened. Further, 27 1.11 28 ///

5

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17

19

18

20

21 22

23 24

25

26

27

28

in accordance with Rule 4 of the rules governing petitions for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, and upon a preliminary review of the Petition, IT IS ORDERED that:

- The Clerk of this Court shall promptly (a) serve a copy of the Petition and a copy of this Order on the Attorney General for the State of California, or his authorized agent; and (b) serve a copy of this Order on Petitioner.
- 2. If Respondent contends the Petition can be decided without the Court's reaching the merits of Petitioner's claims (e.g., because Respondent contends Petitioner has failed to exhaust any state remedies as to any ground for relief alleged in the Petition, or that the Petition is barred by the statute of limitations, or that the Petition is subject to dismissal under Rule 9 of the Rules Governing § 2254 Cases, or that all of the claims are procedurally defaulted, or that Petitioner is not in custody), Respondent shall file a motion to dismiss pursuant to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing § 2254 Cases no later than July 21, 2008. The motion to dismiss shall not address the merits of Petitioner's claims, but rather shall address all grounds upon which Respondent contends dismissal without reaching the merits of Petitioner's claims is warranted. At the time the motion to dismiss is filed, Respondent shall lodge with the Court all records bearing on Respondent's contention in this regard. A hearing date is not required for the motion to dismiss.
- 3. If Respondent files a motion to dismiss, Petitioner shall file his opposition, if any, to the motion no later than August 21, 2008. At the time the opposition is filed, Petitioner shall lodge with the Court any records not lodged by Respondent which Petitioner believes may be relevant to the Court's determination of the motion.
- Unless the Court orders otherwise, Respondent shall not file a reply to Petitioner's opposition to a motion to dismiss. If the motion is denied, the Court will afford Respondent adequate time to respond to Petitioner's claims on the merits.
- 5. If Respondent does not contend that the Petition can be decided without the Court reaching the merits of Petitioner's claims, Respondent shall file and serve an answer to the

If Respondent contends Petitioner has failed to exhaust any state remedies as to any ground for relief alleged in the Petition, the motion to dismiss shall also specify the state remedies still available to Petitioner.

Petition, as well as points and authorities in support of such answer, no later than August 4, 2008. At the time the answer is filed, Respondent shall lodge with the Court all records bearing on the merits of Petitioner's claims. The lodgments shall be accompanied by a notice of lodgment which shall be captioned "Notice of Lodgment in 28 U.S.C. § 2254 Habeas Corpus Case — To Be Sent to Clerk's Office." Respondent shall not combine separate pleadings, orders or other items into a combined lodgment entry. Each item shall be numbered separately and sequentially.

- 6. Petitioner may file a traverse to matters raised in the answer no later than September 4, 2008. Any traverse by Petitioner (a) shall state whether Petitioner admits or denies each allegation of fact contained in the answer; (b) shall be limited to facts or arguments responsive to matters raised in the answer; and (c) shall not raise new grounds for relief that were not asserted in the Petition. Grounds for relief withheld until the traverse will not be considered. No traverse shall exceed ten (10) pages in length absent advance leave of Court for good cause shown.
- 7. A request by a party for an extension of time within which to file any of the pleadings required by this Order should be made in advance of the due date of the pleading, and the Court will grant such a request only upon a showing of good cause. Any such request shall be accompanied by a declaration under penalty of perjury explaining why an extension of time is necessary.
- 8. Unless otherwise ordered by the Court, this case shall be deemed submitted on the day following the date Petitioner's opposition to a motion to dismiss and/or his traverse is due.
- 9. Every document delivered to the Court must include a certificate of service attesting that a copy of such document was served on opposing counsel (or on the opposing party, if such party is not represented by counsel). Any document delivered to the Court without a certificate of service will be returned to the submitting party and disregarded by the Court.

26 ///

27 1//

28 | ///

10. Petitioner shall immediately notify the Court and counsel for Respondent of any change of Petitioner's address. If Petitioner fails to keep the Court informed of where Petitioner may be contacted, this action will be subject to dismissal for failure to prosecute.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: June 5, 2008

Peter C. Lewis
U.S. Magistrate Judge
United States District Co

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)	S: TERRY LYNN HAWKI	NS	• • •
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	S: TERRY LINE HAWK! C.C.F.,§446 & §2015.5; 28	i U.S.C.,81746)	
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES) (C	•		•
TERRY LYNN HAWKINS		nalty of perjury that:	
l am the Petitioner	in the above-entitled act	tion; I have read the foregoing d	locuments and know
l am the <u>Petitioner</u> the contents thereof: and the same is true (of my own knowledge, exce	pt as to those matters stated the	rein upon information
and belief. and as to those, I believe them t	o be true.		•
Executed this 25 day of August 200		rnia State Prison - Lancaster, C	alifornia 93539–845
	•	1) Theking	
	Signature:	(Declarant/Petitioner)	-
		********	•

	PROOF OF SER	VICE .	
		116.C 117461)
- ·	C.C.F., §446 & §2015.5; 20		
l. Eddie Lee Galloway	, am a resident (of California State Prison - in th	e County of Los
Angeles, State of California. I am over the State Prison address is: P.O. 8457	he age of eighteen (18) and	VW/VW MOI is barth of the ar	ove-entitled action. My
State Prison address is: P.O. 8457			
On August 25, 2008	I served the follow	ving documents:	
	R DEFAULT JUDGMENT	UNDER RULE 55(a-b)	
MOTION FO	R DEFAULT CODE		
	•		
	et forth the exact title of do	reument(s) served)	•
•	•		
On the party (ics) herein by placifully paid, or with a Trust Withdrawal S	ng a true copy(ies) thereof, lip (CDC-190) attached the	enclosed in sealed envelope(s), creof, in the United States Mail,	with postage thereon in the manner provided
by at the California State Prison, Lancas	iter. California: 93539	Y GENERAL OF CALIFORNIA	TOTIOMS.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		C PROUNTR	
SOUTHERN DISTRICT 880 FRONT ST. RM. 4290	110 WES	T "A" STREET P.O. BOX 8	3200
SAN DIEGO CA. 92186-5266	SAN DIE	GO CA. 92186-5266	•
	•		

There is delivery service by the United States mail at the place so addressed and/or there is regular communication by mail between the place of mailing and the place addressed. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated August 25, 2008

Declarant/Petitioner